

Summer 7-27-1983

Senate Meeting, July 27, 1983

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, July 27, 1983" (1983). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 543.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/543>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

July 27, 1983

Volume XIV, No. 17

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of June 15, 1983 Meeting

Chairperson's Remarks*

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Appointment

Student Center-Auditorium Programming Board Constitution (2.16.83.1)

Student Center-Auditorium Policy Board Constitution (2.16.83.2)

Committee Reports

Adjournment

*Related materials in Appendix.

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

July 27, 1983

Volume XIV, No. 17

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ritt at 7:05 p.m.

Roll Call

Secretary Gowdy called the roll and announced that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of June 15, 1983 Meeting

XIV-142 On a motion by Mr. Pontius (seconded by Mr. Friedhoff), the minutes of the June 15 meeting were approved on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks*

Mr. Ritt reminded the members of the Senate that the August 17 meeting would be in the Old Main Room of the Student Center. He called attention to the schedule of meetings for January through June, 1984, attached to the July 20 Executive Committee minutes (schedule appended to these minutes).

Mr. Ritt then reported on the election of Professor Hibbert Roberts as the chairperson of the Faculty Advisory Board to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. This advisory board is not directly heard from very much, but our institution and public education in general are well served by the points of view expressed by members of this board.

Mr. Ritt noted for the record that during the last legislative session there was evidence of close cooperation between this university and the representatives from this area. This closeness has developed in the last five years.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Quick was absent (he is out of the country).

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Bedingfield reported that the Student Association is in the process of hiring three new attorneys for the Student Legal Services program. Many applications had been received. The selection process should be completed by next week. A task force was looking at ways to amend the current program and alleviate future problems. Students, administrators, and people from the community had been looking at ways to deal with party issues and ways were being sought to make the Party Patrol more efficient.

Mr. Friedhoff expressed a concern with the practice of police being stationed at the edge of town when students come to school. He thought it would be more helpful if the police could be part of the welcoming process, rather than being in an adversarial role. Mr. Bedingfield said he would discuss this matter with Police Chief Lehr.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins reported that the Governor had signed the appropriations bill quite promptly. The bill was not prepared for his signature until a week ago and was signed within two days. The operating budget for the university for FY-84 was \$69,943,100. Just under \$16 million was made up of income fund--generated by tuition. The Board of Regents approved a 10% tuition increase at the July meeting. It is hoped that the appropriation will remain in effect throughout the year. The budget allows for annualizing the 3% average salary increase from February '83 plus an additional 4.9% increase for those eligible. The increase for general costs will be 3%. Some ground was made up with \$620,000 in the equipment replacement fund. The money will not go into general budgets but will be kept and used by the Provost and college deans for use in academic equipment replacement. The deans are developing a priority list of major needs. If the proposed FY-85 NEPR is approved for equipment replacement, it will be possible to purchase the CAD-CAM equipment for Industrial Technology. The \$620,000 will not be used for that purpose.

Mr. Watkins then reported on the status of HB700 which would provide a separate governing board for Northern Illinois University (NIU). The final version did not contain an appropriation. Although the death of HB700 was prophesied at every level of the legislative process, it did not fail anywhere. Senate sponsor Jack Schaffer, during the last 48 hours of the legislative session, did not think he had 30 votes needed for passage in the Senate, so he did not call the bill. The whole matter is of some consequence to ISU. The bill is still alive. It could be called in the veto session and passed by a simple majority, or it could be put on the calendar next spring. If it does pass, the best thing for ISU would be to have its own separate board.

Mr. Watkins then reported on a matter which should be of concern to the Senate when it considers the university writing exam business item in the next few months. At the July meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) another report (the third since 1977) was made regarding remedial programs in higher education. In 1977 the IBHE, in responding to a State Senate resolution, passed resolutions regarding remedial efforts at state colleges and universities. Such courses should be limited to special assistance programs, with non-degree credit. Special assistance programs were all right (i.e., HPS and the federally funded Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program). Remedial programs were not all right. In post-secondary education, community colleges should respond to remedial needs. In 1979 the IBHE reiterated this point of view and remediation credit was reduced. The Board called for a report on July 1, 1983, to measure various institutions against IBHE standards. There had been general compliance, except for an increase of remediation and an inability to phase it out in public universities. In light of the IBHE position, what do we do with a junior who is doing quite nicely but fails the writing examination? If a remedial program is the answer, that program will come out of the hides of all of us. Sooner or later we will have funds deducted by the IBHE by a formula based on the number of credit hours of students in such a program. The IBHE would not consider funding remedial work for someone at the junior level justifiable.

Mr. Pontius questioned whether the definition of remedial work was to make up high school deficiencies and suggested that a junior writing program would not be doing this. Mr. Watkins reiterated the IBHE position and stated that we had been fortunate to keep the HPS and SSDS programs.

Mr. Plummer said that before the faculty executive session where the report of

salary increases was received last week, no one was aware on the part of this body of the separate process going on for affirmative action adjustments. There was \$10,000 for seven people. He was not aware the URC (University Review Committee) knew about this situation, but such reviews were a major concern of the URC. He felt this separate process was setting a dangerous precedent. Mr. Watkins said it has always been known that the university must make affirmative action equity adjustments or pay a great deal more in terms of legal fees. This is done each year. The affirmative action equity adjustments have been authorized through procedures previously set up. Salaries are regularly adjusted and appear in the Board (of Regents) report. Mr. Plummer pointed out it was not on the report given to the faculty members of the Senate. Mr. Tuttle asked if the \$10,000 came out of the scheduled 4.9% raise money. Mr. Watkins said the \$10,000 was set aside by the Needs and Priorities Committee. In response to another question, Mr. Harden said the regression analysis formula was not used because the population was not big enough on a departmental basis. Mr. Plummer said there was no precedent for doing this outside the system. It was done by department chairpersons and affirmative action officers and with no knowledge of this body. Mr. Friedhoff asked if the need was determined and money found or was money found first and needs met based on that amount? Mr. Watkins said we did what we could with the amount of money (\$10,000) we had. Adjustments were based on seniority--continuous employment. Mr. Eimermann wondered how this situation could occur in the first place. If the system is working correctly, based on merit ratings, then inequities should not be occurring. He would hope the Affirmative Action Office would try to get to the root of the problem rather than continuing to treat it every year.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked Mr. Watkins why NIU was so successful in its efforts to get a separate board. Mr. Watkins said he had never seen evidence NIU has been inadequately considered by our Board of Regents. It gets very sympathetic treatment. He said the universities will be moving into an era where staff work will be very important. He wondered whether NIU is prepared to support internally a staff for putting together reports, studies, etc., for agencies requesting them. He did not know what advantage NIU saw. Senator Schaffer was a passionate supporter who called in all his legislative debts. Many legislators took the attitude "What's the difference, it won't cost any more." If the bill passes, it would be difficult to make a case for continued support of the BOR, and its staff, as it now exists. If this trend continues, the various boards will be nothing more than advisory committees to the IBHE, which would become a superboard.

Mr. Watkins reported that on June 30 Senator Maitland was able to have two capital projects restored to ISU's appropriation -- \$1.8 million for steam lines and \$3.5 million for the remodeling of Cook Hall for use by the music department. The capital appropriation bill has not yet been signed by the governor, but it probably will be. It was gratifying that Senator Maitland had pulled off a real coup for ISU. Our area legislators can get things done.

Mr. Gamsky reported that food service in the student center (1857 Room, Crock and Roll, catering, vending) was now under contract to the DAKA (Dining and Kitchen Administration) Corporation. DAKA serves many other educational institutions (Wisconsin, Harvard Law School, etc.) plus a hundred hospitals and corporations. Kevin Hayes is the DAKA manager. A Dairy Queen operation is expected to be in operation by the time school begins. As with all the other operations in the Student Center, the university receives a cut of the gross receipts.

Mr. Friedhoff asked if it is possible that the bookstore in the Student Center

could have any influence on ordering books -- i.e., influence the length of time a book is used -- or anything like that for fear that if the business loses money the university will lose money? Mr. Gamsky said that would not be the case. The Student Center Bookstore cannot be shown any preference. All the book lists are given to all the store in the community. There is no pressure for faculty to use the same textbook for a given course. All the business enterprises in the Student Center make or break it on their own, without any assistance from the University. From some of the businesses the university receives a guaranteed amount plus a percentage of the gross income.

Action Item

Committee Appointment

XIV-143 Mr. Pontius, Rules Committee Chairperson, noted that at the June 15 meeting, the name of J. William Ruyle, Department of Theatre, was inadvertently omitted from the external committee appointments. He, therefore, moved that Dr. Ruyle be appointed to the University Curriculum Committee to complete a 1985 term. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tuttle and passed on a voice vote.

Information Items

Student Center-Auditorium Programming Board Constitution (2.16.83.1)

Mr. Pontius presented this business item for discussion. He reminded the members that the Senate had approved the division of the Student Center-Auditorium Board into a policy board and a programming board contingent upon approval of constitutions for each board before the beginning of the fall semester. The constitutions were considered last spring by the Student Affairs Committee and then sent to the Rules Committee. Sherry Young, current Student Center-Auditorium Board Chairperson, and Marty McKenzie, a member of the Board, were present to answer questions.

Mr. Hobbs asked why it was not specified that one of the faculty members on the proposed programming board be from the College of Fine Arts as was now specified in the current board in order to provide some sort of liaison between the board and the College of Fine Arts. Ms. Young pointed out the Senate was responsible for selecting the faculty members.

Mr. Mohr asked what were benefits of this separation? Ms. Young responded that goals and functions are different. Policy matters haven't had as much attention as was felt to be needed. With separate boards, more work could be done on each board. The separation had been a recommendation of the task force that reviewed the whole Student Center operation.

Mr. Eimmermann asked if the program board sponsored programs or advised some administrative person who provided programs. The board sponsors the programs and does all the work. Funds come from student fees. The board decides what programs to offer. Fees are allocated to certain programming committees within the board (i.e. Rock and Roll, Video); the Board does decide which programs to sponsor. Martin Jackson, Associate Director of the Bone Student Center, who serves as staff for the board, was asked about determination of funding. Parameters are established by the Fee Board. Mr. Gamsky said a detailed program accounting statement goes before a series of boards. These boards are controlled by students who exercise policies for fiscal guidelines.

Mr. Eimmermann asked if the board had the right to charge for programs and if

user fee money is used to generate additional money? Admission charges go back into the fund for more programs. Mr. Eimermann suggested it would be good to clarify those points within the document itself.

Mr. Pritner wondered how educational and cultural concerns as articulated in the purpose statement are addressed in the programming function. It was his opinion that the educational and cultural level of the programming had substantially diminished. He wondered how this could be addressed. Ms. Young said it was felt that a program such as the Film Society was educational, bringing in avant-garde films; music could be considered educational if it was something new to the listener. Programs are educational for people going to them; serving on the board was educational for students on the board.

Mr. Tuttle asked why nine (9) members were required for a quorum--it was usually a simple majority or a 3/4 majority. With 15 members on the board, why was nine selected as a quorum? Ms. Young said they wanted something more than a simple majority.

Ms. Crafts said it would be helpful to her to have a brief introductory statement which described the relationships among the various boards involved, something short, brief, and to the point to show checks and balances.

Under the statement of purpose, Mr. Rosenbaum asked what does the sentence, "In addition, this Board will enable students to gain first-hand experience in areas not provided for in a classroom situation," add? Ms. Young said it was an important part because students do their own programming, make judgements, and gain first-hand experience through contacting and contracting.

Student Center-Auditorium Policy Board Constitution (2.16.83.2)

Mr. Eimermann asked if the nature of the policy board was advisory to the director, why it would be necessary to have a fiscal agent. Mr. McKenzie said although the Board had not budgeted for any amount for the coming year there might be administrative costs for gaining information by surveys, for travel, or mailing costs. If funds were allocated through the fee board there would be need for a fiscal agent.

Mr. Mohr voiced concerns about the extent people putting on programs would be affected by rules and procedures developed by the policy committee. Would the policy board operate in a vacuum, perhaps insensitive to real problems? Would they get any students to serve on the policy board?

Mr. McKenzie said the problem historically had been that students did not have adequate time to devote both to program and policy functions. With the many recent changes in the student center it was important that policies be given proper attention. A policy board as a separate entity could give such attention.

Mr. Ritt noted that the Senate had already approved the separation of the two groups. The issue now before the Senate was the acceptability of the constitutions.

Mr. Friedhoff noted that under the section on officers, the vice chairperson was a representative of the board at meetings of the Student Center-Auditorium Programming Board. It was determined the statement should read: University Programming Board.

Mr. Parr asked for examples of things the board would give advice about. Among those cited were user fees for meeting rooms, hours of the center, costs of items sold, the aesthetics of the building.

Mr. Pritner asked what would be the appropriate avenue for his concern for what he viewed as an erosion of relationship between academic concerns and entertainment functions provided by student fees. Where does such a channel lie?

Mr. Ritt said it would be appropriate to express concerns to the Rules Committee with suggestions for things to be included. If not taken care of there, the Senator could offer an amendment or oppose the adoption of the constitutions in debate. Questions of a general nature should be referred to the Executive Committee and an appropriate committee could be chosen to study the matter.

Mr. Ritt said it would be helpful to the functioning of the Senate if those who could foresee presentation of amendments would submit such amendments in writing to the appropriate committee before the matter comes for action.

Committee Reports

Joint University Advisory Committee. Mr. Eimermann said a great deal of time was spent during the July meeting concerning salary raises. There was a question of uniformity among the schools and the extent to which reporting systems kept salaries within guidelines. Faculty salary increases at most public colleges were relative to the 10% tuition increase except those at the University of Illinois. While the 10% tuition increase was lower than it might have been (without a tax increase) JUAC expressed concern that any increase does amount to a limitation of accessibility to public education.

They also discussed implications of collective bargaining bills and will collect information about those considerations. There is a great deal of ambiguity in the bills. The Illinois Labor Commission will have to wrestle with these questions and set up ground rules.

The retirement system is budgeted for 62% of gross payout. This amount represents a slight payback, but \$200 million would be needed to pay back the system. Health care for the coming year will be almost the same. A new life insurance company, Fort Dearborn, began coverage July 1, 1983. Fort Dearborn is a subsidiary of Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

The Board study on quality education has yet to take form. One of the JUAC emphases will be to stress what salaries, research, and teaching loads have to do with quality education.

Adjournment

XIV-144 On a motion by Mr. Carmody (seconded by Mr. Tuttle) the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Laura E. Gowdy, Secretary

LEG:pch

[illegible]

ACADEMIC SENATE CALENDAR

Executive Committee

Hovey 308

8:15 a.m.

Academic Senate

Circus Room

Bone Student Center

7 p.m.

July 20, 1983

July 27, 1983

August 10, 1983

August 17, 1983*

August 24, 1983

August 31, 1983

September 7, 1983

September 14, 1983

September 21, 1983

September 28, 1983

October 5, 1983

October 12, 1983

October 19, 1983

October 26, 1983

November 2, 1983

November 9, 1983

November 16, 1983

November 30, 1983*

December 7, 1983

December 14, 1983*

January 11, 1984

January 18, 1984

February 1, 1984

February 8, 1984

February 15, 1984

February 22, 1984

March 14, 1984

March 21, 1984

March 28, 1984

April 4, 1984

April 18, 1984

April 25, 1984

May 2, 1984

May 9, 1984

June 6, 1984

June 13, 1984

July through December meetings approved by the Executive Committee on April 20, 1983

January through June meetings approved by the Executive Committee on July 20, 1983

*Old Main Room, Bone Student Center